

MARRYING MORE THAN
ONE WIFE

THE KUFR OF
THE DENIER

*“...Marry from the women with whom you
are pleased, two, three or four.”*
(An-Nisaa’, Aayat 3)



Published By
MUJLISUL ULAMA OF SOUTH AFRICA
P.O.BOX 3393, PORT ELIZABETH,
6056 ,SOUTH AFRICA

ALLAH'S ORDAINMENT

“...Marry from the women with whom you are pleased, two, three or four.”
(An-Nisaa', Aayat 3)

The standing practice during *Quroon-e-Thalaathah* (The initial three noble eras of Islam) was polygamy or polygyny, i.e. marrying more than one wife – a practise explicitly permitted by the Qur'aan Majeed and numerous Ahaadith. This Practice is embedded in Islam by the practical implementation of the Qur'aanic permission by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah, as well as by the Ambiyaa (Alahimus Salaam) of bygone times.

This Practice ordained by Allah Ta'ala has been the norm throughout the history of Islam. However, in this age in proximity to Qiyaamah, *Zindeeqs* who consist of the modernists masquerading as Muslims, and other miscreant characters of different hues, such as Dawood Seedat of Pietermaritzburg, having fallen prey to western influences, other haraam pressures and the inspiration of Iblees which he urinates into the brains and hearts of the *Zanaadaqah*, are in denial of the explicit Permission granted by Allah Azza Wa Jal for marrying more than one wife.

This rejection by the *Zanaadaqah* eliminates the Imaan of the proponents of monogamy in opposition to polygyny, and it eradicates the Imaan of all the deniers and critics of this Islamic Practice.

Numerous people have communicated with us regarding the *ghutha* (*rubbish and drivel*) bayaan given by Dawood Seedat in Musjidut Taqwa in Pietermaritzburg on 21 October 2019. Voice clips and transcriptions of the utter rubbish kufr disgorged by him have been provided for our comment. It is imperative to guide the Muslim community with the Comment of the Shariah, especially since Dawood Seedat is known as a molvi and a khalifah of Marhoom Maulana Yunus Patel. The kufr effluvium of his talk alienates him from Islam and cancels his Molvi and Khalifah status. As long as he does not issue a public Taubah and return to the fold of Islam unconditionally, Salaat will not be valid behind him, and it will be incumbent to view him as a polecat or a skunk. He constitutes a danger for the Imaan of the unwary masses.

Answering, castigating and excommunicating from Islam characters of Dawood Seedat's ilk, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi issued the following Fatwa which was endorsed by numerous senior Muftis of his time.

HADHRAT GANGOHI'S FATWA

Even those who restrict and fetter the *Mutlaq Hukm* (i.e. *the unfettered general rule*) with the encumbrance of the kaafir court's approval and other factors, are also guilty of kufr for making a compromise which is likewise kufr. Regarding those who scorn and prohibit polygamy, Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (rahmatullah alayh) had the following extremely severe castigation:

“The person who finds fault with any hukm of Allah Ta’ala or with any practice of the Sunnat of the Rasool (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) or views it with derision in any way whatsoever or he rebukes a person who practices it (the hukm of Allah Ta’ala), he is without any doubt *mal-oon and kaafir*. He is an *opponent of Allah Ta’ala*. He is a *Jahannami and a murtadd.....*This *shaqi*, (miserable and unfortunate) *mal-oon* regards his *customary kufr* to be better than the hukm of Allah Ta’ala.

To sever all relationship with such a person is Deen in reality. It is never permissible to maintain family ties with such a person. On the contrary one should sever relationship and regard him to be the *most despicable (mabghoodh) in the creation of Allah Ta’ala, and become his enemy.*

Never perform his Janaazah Salaat because he is a kaafir. So does it appear in the kutub of Hadith, Fiqah and Aqaaid.”

(Fataawa Rashidiyyah, Page 74)

Concurring with this Fatwa, Mufti Muhammad Jamaaluddin Dehlawi (rahmatullah alayh), said: “There is no doubt in the correctness of this (fatwa of Maulana Gangohi). In fact, whoever conceals this mas’alah or with silence refrains from publicizing it, he, according to the Hadith, is a dumb shaitaan (*shaitan akhras*). Whoever, supports such a person even by means of signs (i.e. covertly, not explicitly) will be ***cast upside down into Jahannum*** as it is mentioned in the Hadith.” (Fataawa Rashidiyyah, Page 75)

(*End of Fatwa*)

Many senior Muftis concurred with this Fatwa and appended their substantiating comments and signatures.

Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmed Gangohi and the other senior Muftis have pounded Seedat and his likes with the harsh pejorative epithets of
Mal-oon (one on whom settles the Curse of Allah Ta’ala and His Malaaiakah)
Kaafir (Allah’s opponent)
Jahannami (an inmate of Hell)

Murtad (one who has reneged from Islam)
Shaqi (most unfortunate and miserable)
Mabghood (one on whom is Allah's Wrath)
The most despicable in the creation of Allah.
Janaazah Salaat is not permissible for him.

Dawood Seedat and others of this hue should now reflect on the aforementioned category of villainy into which they fall.

Hadhrat Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh) who was the acknowledged most senior Aalim of Ulama-e-Deoband, had never castigated any faasiq, faajir, bid'ati and zindeeq with the harshness and pejoration with which he had pounded those who even frowned on polygyny. In fact, he was extremely mild even towards the Qabar Pujaari sect.

DAWOOD SEEDAT'S GHUTHA

Deriding polygyny, Seedat said:

“Then if a person is going to take more than one wife in our zamaanah, in our community, in our situation, then what will happen? Nine out of ten times, they become a problem with their family. Family ties get broken.....So you break this family ties which is such an important thing that will get broken....And sulah rahmi is such an important

thing in our Deen that on the Day of Qiyaamat, one of the first things to be reckoned will be salah rahmi.”

Assuming that whatever the moron has disgorged above is factual, then too, the Law of Allah Ta’ala cannot be abolished. It remains haraam and kufr to criticize and seek to cancel any *hukm* of Allah Ta’ala – A *Hukm* explicitly stated in the Qur’aan Majeed on which there exists 100% *Ijma’* of the entire Ummah including all the deviate sects, and practically implemented by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and the entire Ummah down the long corridor of Islam’s more than 14 century history. Criticizing such a Practice and actively canvassing its hallucinated ‘evils’ and advocating abstention, are not merely playing with fire. This attitude deracinates Imaan and renders the shaitaani proponent a *murtad*. Seedat has insinuated that the Institution ordained by Allah Azza Wa Jal is the *cause* of disrupting family ties. He shamelessly and without the slightest vestige of fear for the *La’nat and Ghadab* of Allah Azza Wa Jal makes a direct assault on Allah Ta’ala by deriding that which Allah Azza Wa Jal has ordained. He should have wished to perish before he would reach such a despicable level of kufr which brings eternal damnation in its wake.

'*Zamaanah*' (time / age / era) does not spawn abolition of the Shariah or of any law of the Shariah established categorically by the *Nusoos* of the Qur'aan and Ahaadith-e-Mutawaataarah / Mash-hoorah. *Zamaanah* is not a *naasikh* (abrogator) of Allah's Shariah which was finalized and perfected in the very *Zamaanah* of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

The *Nusoos* of a Divine Shariah can be abolished only by the arrival of a new Nabi, never by the satanic opinions of morons, *zindeeqs* and scholars of ignorance such as those who proliferate the current *zamaanah*, and Seedat is one of these unfortunate miscreants whom shaitaan has ensnared and duped. Thus, he is blind to the huge repugnance of his act of kufr of subscribing to the belief that the explicit and emphatic Law of polygyny is no longer applicable to our current *zamaanah*. That is the conclusion of Iblees. The Shariah of Allah Azza Wa Jal is immutable, hence Allah Ta'ala terminated Nubuwwat more than 14 centuries ago. If this Deen of Islam delivered by Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had been imperfect or if it was the subject of change and addition as were the Shariats of bygone times, then Allah Ta'ala would not have

ended Nubuwwat with the advent of Muhammad (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Zamaanah cannot change nor abolish a single institution of Islam. Only the *zanaadaqah* professing to be Muslims, engage in such satanism. For those who have draped themselves in the satanism of the ‘*zamaanah*’ ‘daleel’, Islam is an evolutionary concept capable of being buffeted, plundered and mutilated to conform to the demands of immoral times and cults. It is indeed a travesty of Allah’s Shariah, to treat the immutable Laws of Islam as antique and artefacts for the museum on the basis of the shaitani daleel of *zamaanah*. The *Ahkaam* of the Divine Shariah by their very nature are ubiquitous and timeless. They are sacred constants of our Deen, the truth of which has to be ceaselessly and rigidly asserted regardless of the wildly fluctuating vagaries of *zamaanah*.

For the edification of this jaahil, it will be salubrious for him to know that 90% of all monogamous marriages of this age are also extremely problematic. Marriages collapse nowadays and have become institutions of sport within days, weeks and months of the Nikah taking place.

Innumerable monogamous marriages collapse, break down and end in divorce with all the concomitant miserable consequences of Talaaq.

In the wake of divorce of monogamous marriages, the effects of severing family ties, non-observance of *Silah Rahmi*, mutual hatred, etc. are now normal. Do such haraam developments entitle a moron to criticize Nikah with even one woman, and to canvass for its abolition? We do understand that a time will yet dawn when this too will be advocated and even monogamy will give way to *zina* which will develop into an accepted and respectable institution. In western society *zina* is already an acceptable norm, hence adultery is not a ground for divorce. The abominability of *zina* has also been expunged from the hearts of the modernist *zanaadaqah*, hence they frown on polygyny while maintaining an awkward stance of silence and acceptability regarding the deluge of extra marital *zina* affairs conducted by even Muslim males.

The induration of kufr in the hearts of professed Muslims has reached such a vile ebb that wives are able to tolerate the extra marital affairs of their husband, but not the second Nikah.

Thus, zina has become more acceptable than nikah. The same kufr attitude is displayed by the parents of girls who become entangled with kuffaar boys at university, etc. They adopt a low-keyed acceptance of the haraam zina relationship which their daughter conducts. However, as soon as she seeks to legalize the relationship with Nikah, then all hell breaks loose. The zina is tolerable, not the nikah.

No one, not even Dawood Seedat, will advocate abolition of marrying one wife nor even criticize it on the basis of the avalanche of problems and divorces which plague monogamous marriages. It is pure satanism to criticize polygyny and to advocate against it because of the resultant problems. The problems are the consequences of jahaalat and the loss of Imaani bearings. The Shariah is no longer the guiding standard of Muslims, hence there are innumerable problems not only in marriages, but in all spheres of life. The problems consequential to second marriages do not justify the kufr of criticizing an institution permitted by Allah Ta'ala and practised by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and the Ummah.

Seedat's rubbish diatribe against the Shar'i injunction of polygyny appears to be motivated by the calamity which had settled on him when he had

taken a second wife. Unable to bear the criticism and threats from close relatives and his first wife, he succumbed to their threats and demands, and callously divorced his second wife. He has now staged a satanic kufr somersault by recklessly embarking on an attack against Allah Azza Wa Jal to justify his miserable action of divorcing his second wife, and to placate the scum to whose threats he had succumbed. Instead of hastening to Taubah for his weakness which constrained the divorce of the second wife, he presents a bold satanic front to criticize Allah's institution in the very same way that Iblees had rebelliously vindicated his refusal to make Sajdah to Hadhrat Aadam (Alayhis salaam).

The kufr of Seedat is worse than the kufr of the zindeeq MPL bogus uucsa clique. While the MPL bogus uucsa clique had abortively laboured to fetter the *Mutlaq* (unconditional) permission granted by Allah Ta'ala for a plurality of wives with the moral caveat stated in the Qur'aanic aayat announcing the permissibility, they (the MPL clique) did not brazenly disparage the polygyny law. They did not call for its abolition nor argued for the hallucinated inapplicability of this sacred Institution in our time and for the Indian community.

They resorted to *baatil ta'weel* (baseless satanic interpretation) in an abortive bid to get their kufr MPL accepted by the government.

On the other hand, Seedat has perpetrated flagrant kufr by propagating the inapplicability of Qur'aanic polygyny, in particular for the Indian community as if the Indian community is excluded from the Shariah. He further aggravated his kufr by disparaging Allah's law, and to bolster his stupid view of kufr, he degenerated into a mess of stupid arguments which exhibit the inanity and profanity of his brains.

Explaining this scenario, a brother from Durban writes:

“I have inserted a recording of a talk of MI Dawood Seedat from PMB. He makes mention of abandoning the Sunnah of 2 or more wives as there are many ills associated with it, and thus to abstain. He gives explanation in this talk which I would like you to explain whether it is indeed correct and if his view is compliant with Sharia.

The reason for me asking this, is not so long ago, ML Dawood himself was pro 2, 3 or 4 wives, and himself took on a second wife.

His mureeds and followers took objection to this and some people abandoned attending his talks. It went as far as his father-in-law from his 1st marriage threatening to kill him if he does not end the second.

So now he states in his talk that his earlier view was his mistake and he made taubah etc. Is this a clear Shar'i fatwa?" (*End of the Brother's letter*).

It is a clear fatwa of Shaitaan. It is a fatwa of kufr.

Those who sever ties with the man who takes a second wife will be hauled into the Divine Court to answer and to be severely punished for their kufr attitude. The one who marries a second wife is not guilty of severing family ties. The proponents of the kufr are the shayaateen. Thus, Seedat's presentation of the severance of family ties as a reason for disparaging polygyny, is stupid and evil. He should divert his chagrin to those who are averse to the Law of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

Assuming that polygyny does culminate in severance of family ties, then too, it is flagrant kufr to call for its abolition or to deride it. It is Allah's decree which has been practically implemented by the Ummah right from Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) down the more than 14 century history of

Islam. Islam with all its beliefs, practices and institutions was perfected in the very age of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). Confirming the perfection of Allah's Shariah, the Qur'aan Majeed states:

“This Day have I perfected your Deen for you, completed My favour for you, and chosen Islam for you as Deen.”

Allah's Law does not tolerate the slightest alteration. Tampering with the Shariah in the manner of the zanadaqah and Dawood Seedat is kufr which expels a man from the fold of Islam. Precisely for this reason did Hadhrat Maulana Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh) declare the opponent of polygyny to be a *murtad*. Janaazah Salaat for him is not permissible.

The inanity of his argument of the lack of mutual love of co-wives

Dawood Seed displays stark senility by presenting as a 'daleel' for the abolition of polygyny, the attitude of co-wives. Thus he stupidly avers:

“...now tell me which two co-wives love one another? Some of them, they just make sabr

Let the moron explain how much love is there between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law in most marriages. The mutual enmity, fitnah and fasaad

existing among them, which generally emanate from the mother-in-law, constrained Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) to depict the mother-in-law as the '*Aunt of Shaitaan*'. Does it stand to reason or is it Islamically valid to canvass against marriage with even one woman on account of this lack of love, and the reign of enmity and animosity? Was Allah Azza Wa Jal not aware of the lack of love in co-wives? Were there no arguments and quarrels among co-wives during the era when Allah Ta'ala had decreed the permissibility of polygyny? The jaahil has blurted out utter kufr drivel.

On the basis of the copro-satanic 'daleel' presented by Seedat, a man should not marry even one wife. Almost every marriage, especially in this age of fitnah, fasaad and female kufr emancipation, is clouded with intense misery. Innumerable monogamous marriages end in divorce with all the bitter and haraam consequences. They even set the Shariah aside to obtain kufr verdicts from the kuffaar courts. Every man who takes a second wife, as well as the second wife who ventures into a marriage to become a co-wife, are aware that there will be no love with the first wife. It is an expected reality which always existed, but which did not prevent the decree of Allah Ta'ala being instituted as a Shar'i

hukm explicitly recorded in the Qur'aan Majeed and implemented by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and the entire Ummah.

The moron further avers about the first wife's emotional state:

“Some of them they just make sabr and keep quiet, but inside there is hurt, there is pain. Who caused that? The man who went and did it.”

When Allah Azza Wa Jal wills to disgrace a man, He afflicts the brains with senility, hence Seedat making a mockery of himself with his kufr averment disgorged this laughable nonsense – laughable, albeit kufr. The ‘hurt inside’ the first wife in no way whatsoever abolishes polygyny nor proscribes it in any way. The Ahaadith emphasizes to her the immense virtue of Sabr. For her Sabr she will gain the status of *shahaadat*.

By heaping blame on the man who takes a second wife, Seedat by implication, directs his stupid criticism at Allah Ta'ala. It is Allah Ta'ala who has allowed polygyny despite being fully aware of the ‘hurt inside’.

He derisively describes this Qur'aanic Instruction, saying: *“The man who went and did it.”* In the context of his silly and kufr criticism of Allah's Law, Seedat's use of the term 'it' is a disparagement of the Law of Allah Ta'ala, and this too is kufr. Stating his kufr with greater clarity, Seedat says: *“It is his fault.....that these two women got hatred for one another.”* This is another implied attack on Allah Azza Wa Jal. Even if we should stupidly assume for a moment that the husband is the cause of the hatred, it cannot be presented as a basis for cancelling the Law of Allah Ta'ala.

The jaahil implies that by Allah Ta'ala allowing a man to take more wives, He – Nauthubillah! – is the cause of the mutual hatred. There were arguments even among the Azwaaj-e-Mutahharaat. The lack of love among co-wives is not a current day development. It existed at all times, even among the wives of the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam). Nevertheless, they married a plurality of wives.

Pouring more derision on the Command of Allah Ta'ala, the moron utterer of kufr said: *“Then in our society if a person has to do this type of thing, then what will happen, nine out of ten times his children become rebellious. He caused it, right?”*

He refers to Allah’s Law of polygyny derisively, saying: “*this type of thing*”. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Ambiya (Alayhimus Salaam), the Sahaabah and the Ummah all have done “*this type of thing*” which Allah Ta’ala has allowed, but which the Seedat Iblees criticizes with satanic derision. The manner in which he expresses himself in addition to being kufr is an exhibition of senility. His brain has become vermiculated with kufr thus he heaps mockery on himself.

Pursuing his abortive shaitaani argument in abnegation of polygyny, Seedat says: “*In today’s zamaanah which man can say that he is making I’tidaal (meting out equality) proper, that he is doing everything by the book when it comes to time, when it comes to nafqah, he is doing everything by the book?*”

Defective discharge of an obligation, defective fulfilment of rights or failure to observe the rights of wives or of any other Islamic institution do not permit cancellation or abrogation or alteration of the immutable laws of Allah Ta’ala. If a man does not correctly mete out equality / justice to his wives, it is in the same category as injustice to the wife in a monogamous marriage.

Just as injustice to a wife in a monogamous marriage is haraam, so too is it haraam in a polygynous marriage. But such injustice cannot be presented as grounds for advocating abstention from marriage whether to one or more women.

While most monogamous marriages of this age are extremely problematic with great injustice committed by husbands, no one ever argues against marriage to one wife. But polygyny is perpetually made a target for shaitaani criticism. Even professed Muslims – so-called Muslims – are on this shaitaani bandwagon awarded to them by the Yahood and Nasaara of this age.

The anti-polygyny campaign is the stercoraceous conspiracy of atheists for opening wide the avenue for fornication and every act of sexual perversion, hence extra marital affairs are encouraged and accepted. The Yahood and Nasaara today are such only by birth or nationality, not by belief. Today most of those who are by birth Christian and Jew are atheists. All universities are institutions of atheism and immorality. The filth of these institutions has been accepted and digested by even Muslims. Thus we find even molvis propagating the ideas, concepts and satanic rubbish of the atheists.

Seedat is in this trap although he may have acquired his anti-polygyny idea from another source.

If Janaazah Salaat or the Fardh Salaat or Sunnah Salaat are draped with bid'ah as is the case in many places, it will be kufr to criticize and to speak derisively of the Institution of Salaat. The bid'ah has to be criticized and people have to be educated regarding the evil of bid'ah and the correct method of performing Salaat. The bid'ah will be made the target, not the Salaat. Similarly, the injustice and the husband's failure to fulfil the rights of his wives should be criticized, not the Institution of Nikah whether it relates to monogamy or polygyny.

A man may not be debarred from marrying one woman on the basis of thousands of men being unjust to their wives. In the same way, a man may not be debarred from marrying a second wife simply because of abuses committed by some men. These abuses are the products of jahaalat and lack of fear for Allah Ta'ala. They are not the effects of polygyny just as they are not the consequences of monogamy.

However, instead of *Amr Bil Ma'roof Nahy anil Munkar* – instead of educating Muslims about virtue and prohibiting evil, Seedat lambasts the very

Institution ordained by Allah Ta'ala. Thus, he conducts himself like the muanaafiqeen and atheists who practice *amr bil munkar* and *nahy anil ma'roof* (commanding evil and prohibiting virtue) as mentioned by Allah Ta'ala in the Qur'aan Majeed.

“Do not present excuses (for your kufr). Verily you have committed kufr after your Imaan.....The munaafiqoon and the munaafiqaat are from one another. They instruct (people) with munkar (evil and sin), and they prevent from ma'roof (virtue), and they withhold their hands. They have forgotten Allah, thus He has forgotten them (i.e. He curses them). Verily the munaafiqeen they are the faasiqoon.”

(Ar-Taubah, 66, 67)

A plethora of labyrinthal stupidities and baseless arguments in vindication of the kufr does not save the skin of the denier or denigrator of Allah's Institution from the kufr whose hallucinated validity he has abortively attempted to substantiate by means of zig-zagging between his warped logic and Shar'i narrations. The quotient of such zig-zagging is nothing but kufr which is abhorrent to Allah Ta'ala, and most pleasing to the bogus uucsa *zanaadiqah*.

No one advocates injustice to wives. The unjust conduct of husbands is to be criticized, and they

should be educated regarding the rights of their wives, whether it is a polygynous or a monogamous marriage. But the criticism must be restricted to the conduct of the husband, not to the sacred Institution of Nikah.

Embarking on another stupidity in his shaitaani campaign against polygyny, the unfortunate fellow says:

“Nikah is something which is supposed to bring a person closer to Allah Ta’ala. But we find that generally when a person goes down this road, he gets distant from Allah Subhaanahu wa Ta’ala because there is so many problems, so many fights, so many issues, the gheebat that carries on. There is no real happiness.”

There is no doubt in the fact that Nikah enhances Divine Proximity. It is not a whimsical supposition as posited by Seedat in the aforementioned averment. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) did aver that *Nikah is half of Imaan*. But, a jaahil or a faasiq whose very Imaan dangles on a thread will not necessarily acquire this Proximity only by virtue of Nikah. Islam is a total and an all-embracing Code of Life. It is only submission to the life-style ordained by Allah Ta’ala which will ensure the acquisition of the numerous benefits of the great

variety of *ahkaam* of the Shariah. All the *ahkaam* have been divinely designed for our worldly benefit and for our benefit and salvation of the Aakhirat. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Whatever is by Allah is obtainable only by obedience unto Him.”*

Just as polygyny does not produce for the juhala, fussaag and fujjaar the stated Divine Proximity, so too, is it with monogamy. A man who drifts away from Allah Ta’ala after taking a second wife, has already drifted from Allah Ta’ala even prior to marrying the second wife. He was already in the limbo of jahaalat and fisq even with his one wife. Blaming such a man’s drift from Allah Ta’ala on the Institution of Polygyny is by implication denial of the Wisdom and Decree of Allah Azza Wa Jal.

This moron has failed to understand that ‘real happiness’ is a phantom in this dunya. On his deathbed, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) exclaimed: *“There is no happy life except the happy life of the Aakhirat.”*

Morons and those whose focus is not on Allah Ta’ala pursue the phantom of worldly happiness which they hallucinate.

The ingeminated refrain of the Qur'aan Majeed is:
“The life of this world is but play and amusement while the Abode of the Aakhirat is best for those who have fear. What have you no intelligence (to understand this self-evident reality)?”

How is it ever possible for Mu'min to experience even a semblance of 'real happiness', be it of a transitory nature, if he pours disdain and opprobrium percolating kufr on the Ordainment of Allah Ta'ala? All morons of Seedat's ilk should understand, in the interests of their Imaani welfare, that the standard for measuring the veracity, validity and authenticity of the commands of the Shariah is not the happiness or unhappiness or the pleasure or displeasure of even the combined Ummah of the east and west. Rejecting Seedat's *ghutha*, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“Whoever searches for the Pleasure of Allah at the cost of the displeasure of the people, Allah suffices for him for all the problems of people (i.e. the problems they create for him). And, whoever searches for the pleasure of the people at the cost of Allah's Displeasure, Allah will cast him to the people.”

Allah Ta'ala will abandon such a miserable moron to be buffeted disgracefully by the very people

whose pleasure he cultivates regardless of Allah's Displeasure which follows in the wake of the haraam pursuit of people's pleasure. Thus the drift of a man from Allah Ta'ala as a consequence of his second marriage (i.e. getting 'distant from Allah Ta'ala' as alleged by Seedat) is the effect of his pursuit of the pleasure of the people. Succumbing to the haraam pleasure of the people, the man commits the cruel and haraam act of divorcing his second wife. The pressure of the first wife and her parents on the husband – the pressure which constrained him to divorce the second wife for no valid reason – is the satanism which is one of the stupid shaitaani '*daleels*' of Seedat for his kufr propagation.

No one is distanced from Allah Ta'ala by virtue of implementing a decree of Allah Ta'ala. No one becomes *mardood* by accepting and acting in accordance with any *hukm* of Allah Ta'ala regardless of the Fiqhi (juridical) classification of the *hukm*.

Again heaping derision on Allah's Institution of Polygyny, this most unfortunate chap describing the Permission granted by Allah Ta'ala, says:

"When a person goes down this road, he gets distant from Allah Ta'ala..."

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Ambiya (Alayhimus Salaam), the Sahaabah and the Auliya, etc., etc., etc., all went “*down this road*”, and they were never distanced from Allah Ta’ala. Seedat has pejoratively employed the phrase, ‘*down this road*’, as if it is a contemptible, loathsome road. His entire bayaan related to polygyny is a diffusion of *kufr*.

The ‘fights’ and the ‘gheebat’, etc. to which he makes reference are not specialities and peculiarities of polygynous marriages. There are deluges of these very issues in even monogamous marriages, and even among unmarried people, and also in society in general. It is callously unjust to single out a permitted Institution of Islam for devilish criticism. ‘Fights’ and ‘gheebat’ are universal norms of all people, in all spheres of life, including Muslims who are bereft of Taqwa. ‘Fights’ and ‘gheebat’ cited as grounds for campaigning against a sacred Institution ordained by Allah Ta’ala is indeed mind-boggling for a Muslim.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that *Nikah is his Sunnah*. This Sunnah is not restricted to marrying one wife. The Sunnah is equally applicable to a plurality of wives.

The very grounds presented by the miscreant molvi who has lost the Path of Imaan, for his anti-polygyny call, can be presented for abolition of monogamy as well.

Along with the commission of vermicide, Seedat demonstrates most stupidly his jahaalat by saying:

“Even the one who he had happy is not happy too. So what has he really achieved? And if you see generally a person who does this type of thing and then sometimes his barkat goes away, then other times a lot of problems come in his life because he is taking so much of bid duas. He is taking bid duas all the time, bid duas of the wives he took, bid duas of the children, bid duas of the broader families, lot of bid duas and he is not making I’tidaal. Where will there be barkat?”

The atrocity of this averment whilst extracting mirth, reflects the extreme senility of his mind. This statement is a disgorgement of utter nonsense. For his edification, we again remind him that “*this type of thing*”, i.e. polygyny, was ‘done’ also by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Ambiya (Alayhimus salaam) and the Sahaabah. There is no shame in “*this type of thing*”.

What has constrained the jaahil to make such a derisive reference to Allah's Law? It is kufr which has driven him to this degenerate level.

All the votaries of '*bid duas*' (*curses*) mentioned by the chap are travelling along the path of kufr. Their curses are unjust, unfounded and boomerang on themselves. They are in fact heaping curses on the Institution of Allah Ta'ala. The curses are struck into their faces from the heaven. The Portals of the Heaven are closed for unjustified curses which are then struck into the faces of those who had disgorged such shaitaani '*bid duas*'.

Deluges of such devilish '*bid duas*' do not justify the campaign seeking the abolition of polygyny. Nothing said by the moron justifies detraction from the permissibility ordained by Allah Ta'ala. Just as a curse can befall a husband who fails to execute the rights of his two wives, so too can a curse befall a man who fails to observe the rights of his one wife. So, "*bid duas*" are not confined to polygynous marriages.

Furthermore, recalcitrance is not the capital of only miscreant husbands. Wives too suffer from this *shaiyaaniyat*.

They trade their Imaan for the miserable pittance which the kuffaar courts award them when they proceed to such courts to suck haraam money from their ex-husbands in total denial of the commands of the Shariah. They too are the receptacles of ‘bid duas’ of the ex-husbands. This type of thing occurs in abundance in monogamous marriages which flounder and end in turmoil and Talaah.

The moron who is campaigning against polygyny should also campaign against recalcitrant ex-wives of monogamous marriages, and he should also campaign against the recalcitrancy of husbands in monogamous marriages. He should not single out an Institution allowed by Allah Ta’ala and practically implemented by Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah, for disgorging his vitriol.

A Mu’min of healthy Imaan will direct *naseehat* to the abuses of husbands whether their injustice and oppression apply to polygynous or monogamous marriages. Despite the existence of husband oppression and injustice even during the era of Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), plurality of wives was never proscribed. Rather, the Shariah’s chagrin was directed to the abuses. Thus, Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“A man who does not deal with justice between his two wives will be resurrected on the Day of Qiyaamah with half of his body paralyzed.”

How is it possible to proscribe or abolish polygyny, when the Qur’aan Majeed declares: *“...Marry from the women with whom you are pleased, two, three or four.” (An-Nisaa’, Aayat 3)*

The commencement with marriage to “two” women, not with one is significant for the absolute permissibility of polygyny which is not a mere concession as some apologists maintain. Even some Ulama have succumbed to modernist influences, hence they dub this permissibility a ‘concession’. The very same Aayat mentions monogamy as the last option to be availed of only if a man believes that he will be unable to mete out justice to several wives. If a man is able to deal equitably with a plurality of wives, then marrying more than one woman is permissible without the slightest compunction.

The moron’s fallacious, shaitaani, stupid analogies

In a flaccid attempt to convey the idea that he is not anti-Sunnah, Seedat said: *“So we must understand something that definitely it is a Sunnah of Nabi*

Kareem (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), but this Sunnah falls in this category whereby that if by going to make amal upon this Sunnah so many wrongs are going to take place, injustices are going to take place, problems are going to come about, peace is going to be shattered, right? Then the objective is not being achieved. In that type of situation it is better for a person not to do this, not to get involved in this.”

The jaahil has brazenly exhibited his ignorance and compounded his kufr with this rubbish averment which is devoid of any Shar’i substance. Problems and injustices are haraam issues totally unrelated to the Sunnah. Making *amal on the Sunnah (i.e. practical implementation)* does not culminate in injustice, oppression and haraam. These are the consequences of the evil of the *nafs* which is enslaved to *shaitaaniyat*. There are innumerable cases, in fact the vast majority of cases of monogamous marriages, which suffer the same fate as polygynous marriages are due to the ignorance and villainy of husbands. So by the same token postulated by Seedat, *“Then the objective is not being achieved. In that type of situation it is better for a person not to do this, not to get involved in this.”*

Now when the ‘objective’ according to Seedat “is not achieved” even with one wife, then it logically follows on the basis of his convoluted theory of kufr, that “it is better for a person not to do this, not to get involved in this”, i.e. not to marry even one wife. This is his kufr piled on kufr.

In the many decades that we have been dealing with the Muslim community, we have received thousands of letters from wives in monogamous marriages bitterly complaining of husband-abuses and oppression. In comparison with the *thousands* of such letters, we can count on the fingers of one hand the number of letters received from wives in polygynous marriages. From the many thousands of letters from one-wife marriages, we reproduce here just one for the edification of Seedat.

A wife’s lament

“I am married for 19 years and we have 2 daughters. My husband doesn't take care of the girls and myself. He doesn't buy them anything at all. No clothes, no toiletries, nothing. Nor does he do anything for me. He only contributes R2,000 a month which he says is the money for the groceries. With the cost of living and daily necessities being expensive, I have been forced to work and take care of the girls and myself as these monthly expenses are being totally ignored by my husband.

School and madressah fees, meat, telephone, fuel, clothes when necessary, and the list goes on.

However, this is not the only issue I face daily as a wife. My husband never gives time to me or the girls at all. He doesn't talk to us at all unless its necessary. He goes to the gym daily without fail 5 times a week for 3 HOURS daily. He comes home on his time demanding that the food be ready. I'm not allowed to be in the kitchen cleaning up or doing anything whilst he has his supper. He never eats with us. Once his done eating, immaterial of the time, then only can I go and clean up the kitchen. The past few years have gotten extremely unbearable to such an extent that I, despite being his wife, am not allowed to sleep in the same room on the same bed with him.

Due to his excessive use of steriods which he acquires fraudulently from his Muslim pharmacist friend, he no longer gets intimate with me. Its been months on end that he fails to fulfil my conjugal rights. When i try and talk to him he says he has the right to deny me my conjugal rights and if im patient i will get better in the hereafter.

He insults me due to the weight-gain of child birth. He has physically abused me on numerous occasions and once it was so bad that he broke my nose. As a husband and father, he doesn't fulfill any of his duties. He only goes to gym and watch football which always comes 1st and he always says he has the right to do as he wishes being the husband. As a wife im being neglected, abused tormented and i have needs which are not being fulfilled and im afraid of breaking the

laws and commands of Allah. Kindly advise what should I do?

Whenever i speak to him about not taking care of us he always claims and says he doesn't earn enough to do or take care of us. But he has money for everything else. Last month or so just on one type of growth hormone steroid and few other steroids he spent over R4,000. This month about the same used on steroids besides the ones he fraudulently acquired from the Muslim pharmacist friend who helps him.”

(End of letter)

Seedat’s hallucinated objective has not been attained and is not being attained in the vast majority of monogamous marriages. Thus, restricting his criticism to polygynous marriages is stupid. Targeting more than one- wife marriages is clearly kufr.

The stupidity and kufr of the ‘greater good’

Multiplying his kufr, Seedat atrociously says:

*“Just like how he will not, you know, accept his wife to force the issue with him to sleep on a straw mat, and he will not accept vinegar as a curry, and he will not accept just barley mixed with water as a meal, although she can say but these things are all sunnat. In the same way he must **not force it** (i.e. Nikah to a second wife – Mujlisul Ulama) down her*

throat that this is a Sunnah and you just have to accept it. If the lady – she cannot manage it. Something she cannot do, the husband should not force her to do so, something she cannot do, keeping the greater good in mind.”

There is a glut of moron molvis roaming on the surface of the earth masquerading as Mujtahideen, and this fellow Seedat, is one of them. Even a layman’s brains are titillated by the laughable rubbish which Seedat has disgorged here. While a wife may not attempt to compel her husband to consume food which is unpalatable for him, and vice versa as well, analogizing a second Nikah with vinegar and barley is beyond the confines of the ludicrousity. If a man has no desire for consuming vinegar or barley mixed with water, he commits no sin, and if he does consume it, it is perfectly permissible, and if he consumes it with the niyyat of Sunnah, then it will be a meritorious act for which he will receive *thawaab*. But it will be *haraam* to prohibit him from consuming these types of Sunnah foods. It is not a question of ‘forcing it down his throat’. ‘Forcing it down his throat’ is *haraam*. He selects these foods of his own free will. Similarly, he selects a second wife of his own free will. Preventing him from the consumption of vinegar / barley is *haraam*.

Likewise, is it haraam to prevent him from taking a second wife. It is a matter for his choice. He does not require the permission of his wife or of anyone else to consume vinegar and barley in the style Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah had consumed.

The fellow has failed to utilize his brains, in fact, he lacks the ability for correct intellectual comprehension, hence he demeaned himself with the utter nonsense and rubbish of drawing a comparison between a second Nikah and vinegar / barley.

Just as a man is free to resort to the simple food style and simple dress style of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), so too is he absolutely free to take a second wife. Just as it is haraam to prevent him from the adoption of simplicity and austerity in food and dress, so too is it haraam to prevent him from marrying a second, a third and a fourth wife.

When a man marries a second wife, he does not ‘force her down the throat’ of the first wife just as he does not force her to consume vinegar and barley if he consumes it. He marries the second wife. It is not the first wife who marries the second wife.

It is the man's permissible act on terms of the Qur'aanic licence Allah Ta'ala has granted him. In which way does he force the second wife down the throat of the first wife? In which way does he force vinegar and barley down the throat of his wife if he selects to consume these foods? Her aversion for the second wife may not be interpreted to mean that the husband is "forcing her down the throat" of his first wife. Her attempt to prevent him from taking a second wife is tantamount to kufr.

The polygyny Sunnah is for the man to practice, not for the woman. Therefore, Seedat's statement: "*If the lady cannot manage it, something she cannot do, husband should not force her to do something she cannot do, keeping the greater good in mind.*", is incongruent rubbish which consists of stupidities. What is this '*something she cannot do*'? What has the husband asked her to do when he marries a second wife? If she cannot accept the reality and validity of the second wife, her attitude does not cancel the validity of the second Nikah nor does it imply something being 'forced down her throat'. On the contrary, she and miscreants such as Seedat, are struggling abortively to force their haraam down the throat of the man who desires to take a second wife.

Allah Ta'ala did not condition the validity of a second, third and fourth Nikah with the consent of the first wife. In fact, the Nikah will be valid without even informing the first wife. In taking a second wife, the man is not violating any of the rights of his first wife. If she is not satisfied with Allah's Law, then she can take the route to Jahannam just as many wives take the route of the kuffaar court for the extravasation of haraam money from their ex-husbands.

Talk of the 'greater good' in this context is pure drivel. The 'greater good' is ruined and eliminated by the haraam action of the first wife and her relatives, as well as by miscreant members of the community – all of whom are in a satanic alliance against Allah's Shariah. The 'greater good' cannot be procured by means of haraam interference – by means of the commission of kufr – in the *ahkaam* of the Shariah.

The husband is not asking his first wife to 'manage' the second wife as the jaahil contends. There is nothing for her to 'manage' regarding the second wife. She should only manage her nafs and her Imaan to ensure that she does not pave the pathway of Hell for herself. Islam has designed for her Sabr as the method for 'managing' herself and her nafs.

Contrary to the corrupt advice of Seedat, the Shariah does not impose on the man a lifetime's Sabr for abstention from a second marriage to assuage the haraam dictates of his first wife. But Islam does impose on the first wife a lifetime of Sabr when her husband marries a second wife. For such Sabr she will gain the status of a *Shaheed*. Since Seedat has acquitted himself like a donkey, he has inversed the order of Sabr. Instead of advising the wife with Sabr, he emphasizes that the husband should abstain from the permissibility of subsequent marriages and adopt Sabr.

The Hoors (Damsels) of Jannat

Sliding further into the dregs of jahaalat, Seedat stupidly struggles to justify abstention from marrying a second wife, and by implication abolition of polygyny, by citing the reward of *Hoors* which a man will be granted in Jannat. Atrociously uttering nonsense, he says:

“So you have to make sabr for this lifetime, in Jannat Allah Paak will give him hoors and everything so that he don't have to worry. Allah Paak will give him hoors, right?”

The Damsels of Jannat are rewards for Ibaadat and obeying Allah Ta'ala, not for committing kufr, not

for campaigning against an Institution which Allah Ta'ala permits and which was practically implemented by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and the Ummah. Were these illustrious Souls of the Ummah not aware of the Hoors of Jannat? Why then did our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah resort to polygyny? In terms of the convoluted satanic logic of Seedat, the Hoors of Jannat will be the reward for patiently abstaining from a second wife. Why did our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah not understand it in this way? Did they ignore the Hoors by abandoning 'sabr' by marrying second, third and fourth wives? One kufr leads to another kufr.

When the first wife causes grief to her husband who has married a second wife, then these very Hoors of Jannat whom Allah Ta'ala has created for the man, invoke Allah's *La'nat* (Curse) on the first wife. Thus, introducing the Hoors into this scenario is satanically stupid.

Apologetically damning the Haqq of Allah's Law

Further compounding his baatil and kufr, Seedat very cunningly and subtly seeks to villianize the Institution of Polygyny.

He in fact shamelessly retracts his earlier belief. Earlier he had traversed the other extreme, that is, of propagating the almost *Wujoob* of a plurality of wives. He had acquitted himself in a manner conveying that taking a second wife was *Waajib*. Perhaps that stance was in support of himself since he had married a second wife. Justifying his satanic somersault, Seedat says:

“So the reason I am mentioning all these things to you, (i.e. all the kufr –Mujlisul Ulama), you are all very well aware years back I had given many talks after we came back from Bangladesh, whether it was individual friends or from the mimbar or I was in different towns, etc., and in those talks I had promoted this aspect (of a second Nikah – Mujlisul Ulama) very very hard, no very very firm of taking more than one wife. But that was my cum-fehmi (i.e. ignorance), my misunderstanding, a mistake on my part. I didn’t understand it. Today I thank my elders, my asaatiza, my Akaabireen mashaaiikh. Alhamdulillah, they are around and they can make you understand something. They are still there to explain to you.”

In this monstrous atrocity, he has uttered utter flapdoodle bunkum which adequately portrays his *jahaalat* and *dhalaalat*. Who are these ‘akaabireen’ and ‘asaatiza’ who have condoned and supported his

kufr? Let him name them. In fact, Seedat lacks even a hazy idea of the meaning of ‘Akaabireen’. If any of his teachers had endorsed his kufr belief regarding polygyny, then the teacher too will be an enemy of Allah Ta’ala. He too is damned and earmarked for Jahannam.

The drivel about ‘Akaabireen’ is a blatant lie. There is no senior Aalim who will agree with the kufr disgorged by Seedat. The one who does agree with Seedat on this issue is also an agent of Iblees. He should mention who these ‘akaabireen’ are. In all probability he was advised not to stupidly campaign, and not to stupidly exhort all and sundry, the juhala alike, to marry second wives. In view of crass ignorance, total lack of Taqwa and the preponderance of *fisq* and *fujoor* of the vast majority of people, who perpetrate *zulm* without the slightest compunction he was advised to abstain from reckless campaigning. Seedat was thus advised not to recklessly go on a campaign to exhort unscrupulous men taking second wives. No teacher would ever have advised him to go on a campaign of kufr targeting the Institution ordained by Allah Azza Wa Jal.

Now, currently, he has wildly swung to the other worse extreme. He is now in a campaign of kufr.

Something has gone drastically amiss with his aql and imaan. May Allah Ta'ala protect us from the evil of the nafs and the snares of the devil whom Seedat has now appointed as his guide and sheikh.

He attributes his earlier correct Islamic view to '*cum fahmi*', i.e. to lack of understanding. His satanic somersault now confirms his abject *jahaalat* and that shaitaan is manipulating his brains for the production of kufr. Thus, Seedat has degenerated from his *cum-fahmi* to glaring *kufr*. His brains are clouded with Satanism, hence he fails to understand a simple Qur'aanic truth. Continuing the justification of his kufr, Seedat disgorges more rubbish:

“I want to ask all of you maaf.....that it was very misleading on my part, an error on my part, a mistake on my part. So firstly to ask you people maaf, secondly to make ruju (i.e. retraction) from what I had been saying. It was wrong explanation. There was no need to revive that Sunnah. There is no need for that.”

His stupid talk is cluttered with such atrocious drivel which exhibits the putridity of his necrotized brains and the hidden kufr in his heart. A Muslim whose Aql functions in the state of Imaani equilibrium will not utter the kind of shaitaani twiddle spewed out by

Seedat. His ludicrous ‘*maaf*’ plea which he ingloriously and monotonously ingeminates is in fact a veiled tirade against the explicit Law of Allah Azza Wa Jal as pronounced in the Qur’aan Majeed and implemented practically by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Ambiya in general, the Sahaabah and the entire Ummah down the long passage of Islam’s history. Not a single authority of Islam had ever clamoured against polygyny.

Only *zindeeqs* of the 20th Christian century – professed Muslims who have lapped up the vomit and the faeces of the Yahood and Nasaara at the universities where their brains were fitted in the straitjackets of atheism – present satanic concoctions and convolutions regarding Islam’s Law of polygyny in their exercise of apologetism to make the *ahkaam* of Islam adequately anodyne for kuffaar consumption.

To the best of our knowledge, this Seedat miserable character is the first molvi who has joined the train of the *zanadaqah* on the polygyny issue. He shamelessly claims that his earlier stance which was in reality a propagation of a Qur’aanic law, was a ‘mistake’, an ‘error’, a ‘wrong portrayal’, etc. The implication of his new satanic stance is that Allah Ta’ala has erred –*Nauthubillaah!*

– in having permitted polygyny. A Muslim should supplicate that Allah Ta’ala should seal his tongue with thorns or paralyze his tongue before he could venture to utter such obnoxious notoriety which has issued from the noxious mouth of Seedat. Only one who lacks fear for Allah Ta’ala, who has no idea of the pangs of Maut, and who has no conception of what is due to transpire in the Qabar and in Qiyaamah, will have the shaitaani audacity to go on a campaign against an explicit permissibility of Allah Ta’ala – a right granted by Allah Ta’ala to a man – a right which the opposition of the juhala and the problems stated by Seedat can never cancel or curtail.

The moron says: *“That there is no need to revive it.”* This piece of *jahaalat* presupposes that polygyny has become defunct or non-existent in the Ummah. On the assumption that this is so, then reviving it will be imperative. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said:

“He who clings to my Sunnah at the time of the corruption of my Ummah, will receive the reward of a hundred shuhada (martyrs).”

In some places, notably Hindu India, marrying a widow is considered extremely vile.

Hadhrat Maulana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (Rahmatullah alayh) and other Akaabir Ulama as well have propounded the virtues of marrying widows in the Indian context which was spawned by the customs of the Hindu mushrikeen who worship millions of deities, including faeces. In the wake of a man marrying a widow in the Indian scenario come many problems, the kind of problems which the moron Seedat says are spawned by Islam's Law of Polygyny. Precisely on account of such problems and societal persecution will a man attain the reward of a hundred martyrs for reviving the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) – any Sunnah, be it the Sunnah of the Miswaak, the Sunnah of placing the right foot first in the shoe, the Sunnah of marrying a widow or the Sunnah of polygyny in a place where this Qur'aanic permissibility has been abolished or where it is despised or frowned on.

However, the Sunnah of marrying more than one wife has not died. It is alive and many Muslims all over the world avail themselves of this right granted to them by the Qur'aan. Thus, the chap's statement that there is no good in reviving polygyny is devoid of intelligent substance. Whilst marrying a second wife is very much alive, it is not widely practiced. A man desires a second wife; hence he marries.

What capital crime did he commit which has motivated the devil's agent to embark on his anti-Qur'aan campaign? Just as a man who marries one woman may not be slated, so too should be the stance when a man marries a second or a third or a fourth wife.

The issue of injustice may not be presented as valid grounds for embarking on a campaign to abolish Allah's Law. Injustice and oppression are perpetrated on a massive scale in even monogamous marriages. Simply on account of such abuses, it is haraam to campaign against Nikah whether it be monogamous Nikah or polygynous Nikah. The need is to educate the juhala who enter into the domain of Nikah. They must be taught the rules, etiquettes, rights and obligations which are the consequences of Nikah.

An institution of Islam cannot be abolished if malpractices and evils become attached to it. The campaign of education has to be directed at the evils, not against the Institution. Seedat's stupid and kufr 'ruju' (retraction), which is in reality a stance against Allah Azza Wa Jal, is underlined by sinister motivation which society has imposed on him. He has not presented a single valid Shar'i argument to justify his shaitaani 'ruju' and his plea of 'maaf'.

In fact, he has only succeeded in making a mockery of himself.

He also abortively seeks to justify his shaitaani campaign with the argument that polygyny while valid for other communities, i.e. non-Indian Muslims, is not valid or not practical for Indian Muslims. In other words, he has satanically restricted the operation of the unfettered permissibility of polygyny granted by the Qur'aan to *all* Muslims. There is absolutely no daleel for hallucinating that Indian Muslims or Muslims of any other racial group are excluded from the generality of the permissibility. From whence did this moron, self-appointed, paper 'mujtahid' acquire the idea that Indian Muslim men are not as free as men of other racial communities to marry more than one wife?

In his silly talk, in atrocious phraseology, Seedat implies with his flaccid arguments that Indian Muslim wives will be rendered a grave injustice if the husband takes a second wife. According to him, because of her 'sacrifices' for her husband, the first wife does not deserve the 'injustice' and the 'oppression' of her husband marrying a second wife. He hallucinates that the second Nikah *per se* is unjust. The miscreant has brazenly exhibited kufr by

implying that marrying a second wife is egregiously improper. To him, the feelings of the first wife are of greater importance than the Law of Allah Ta'ala.

He stupidly argues and implies that since it is haraam to break family ties, which a second marriage does according to his hallucination, it is therefore not permissible to marry a second wife. Abstention from a second marriage is necessary to prevent the breaking of family ties, the observance of which is Sunnah. This is shaitaani logic. Just as shaitaan could not understand the command to prostrate to Nabi Aadam (Alayhis salaam), so too is Seedat unable to understand the permissibility granted by Allah Ta'ala to a man to take a second wife. In shaitaan's logic, making Sajdah for Aadam (Alayhis salaam) was shirk. While he was always prepared to be devoted to Allah Ta'ala and to make his life Waqf for Allah Ta'ala, he was not prepared to obey the Law of Allah Ta'ala, just as Seedat is not prepared to obey the polygyny law of Allah Ta'ala. But he blabbers about the Sunnah.

It appears from the pejorative term he uses to describe the second Nikah that he subconsciously believes like Shiahs that Allah Ta'ala has erred – Nauthubillah! – in what he calls “*this thing*”.

He repeatedly refers to the second Nikah derisively, saying: “*this thing*”. “This thing” is in fact the sacred Nikah bond permitted by Allah Ta’ala.

Seedat, in order to justify his campaign against polygyny, stupidly harps on the ‘sacrifices’ of the first wife in the Indian community as if all women in other Muslim communities are totally lacking in devotion to their husbands, and as if all Indian wives are paragons of devotion and sacrifice for their husbands. Today there are innumerable Indian Muslim wives who act exactly like lewd kuffaar women. They display no difference. Modernity and western influences have ruined their natural *haya*, just as these evils have ruined the self-same natural attributes of women of other communities.

It is satanically presumptuous to maintain that only Indian women are devoted to their husbands and only Indian women make sacrifices for their husbands. There are innumerable kuffaar women who are devoted to their husbands. They too make sacrifices. Whatever the reality of the stupid devotion and sacrifice driven ‘daleels’ of Seedat are, this is absolutely no justification for a campaign against Allah’s Law.

Dawood Seedat has not only exposed himself to kufr, he has actually committed kufr. His entire blabber is cluttered with the kufr of deriding an institution which Allah Ta'ala has ordained, and which has been practically implemented by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Sahaabah and the Ummah in general. Never had any authority of Islam criticized polygyny. It is permissible just as a first marriage is permissible.

The status of the villain who criticizes polygyny has been adequately described by Hadhrat Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi (Rahmatullah alayh). All the pejorative epithets with which Hadhrat Gangohi had pounded the critic of polygyny are applicable to Seedat. The Mashaikh say: "*Imaan is suspended between fear and hope.*" We should fear. We do not know what can overcome us tomorrow. Will our Imaan be in tact tomorrow? Many great men – Auliya who were men of *Ilhaam* and *Karaamat* – had left this dunya without Imaan. May Allah Ta'ala save us from the evil of our nafs and the snares of Iblees.